

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

SHAHEED TAALIB'DIN MADYUN,

Plaintiff,

v.

CAROL COOK,

Defendant.

ORDER

3:08-cv-030-bbc

Plaintiff, a pro se state prisoner proceeding in forma pauperis, has filed many claims against many defendants in what the court has divided into nine separate lawsuits. This particular lawsuit alleges that in 2001, defendant put “medicine or poison” in plaintiff’s food and that in 2002 she intentionally hurt him in retaliation for defendant filing lawsuits. This court dismissed the first claim for failure to exhaust, leaving only the retaliation claim. Before the court is plaintiff’s July 14, 2008 motion to compel discovery responses. *See* dks. 57-59. Defendant opposes the motion. *See* dks. 60-61.

Plaintiff complains that defendant has not provided sufficient answers to his requests for production of documents (RFPs) Nos. 4 - 7 and 10 - 16. Plaintiff argues generally that the requested documents contain information relevant to his claim and that he is not seeking confidential personnel records. Plaintiff offers some additional general observations about what constitutes relevant discovery and why but he does not bother to provide any details regarding any of the eleven RFPs whose sufficiency he challenges. *See* Plaintiff’s Brief in Support, dkt. 58.

Defendant responds by synthesizing each disputed RFP, defendant’s response and her rationale. *See* dkt. 60. Having considered each of these responses, I find that defendant responded appropriately to all RFPs. That said, if plaintiff rephrases RFPs 5 and 7 as

interrogatories, then defendant will have to answer them. If plaintiff appropriately narrows RFP 6, then defendant will have to provide responsive information. If defendant has any information responsive to RFPs 12 or 13, then she must provide it forthwith to the court for in camera review so that I can determine relevance and if necessary, redacted disclosure. As matters stand now, defendant need not provide any additional information in response to plaintiff's RFPs.

It is ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to compel discovery, dkt. 57, is DENIED.

Entered this 6th day of August, 2008.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge